REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 22-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Rejection Under O'Donnel, Kohar, Kalev, Hsu and Lipsanen

Claims 1-13, 16-20 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Number 6,266,514 issued to O'Donnell on July 24, 2001 in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,987,976 issued to Kohar on January 16, 2006 and U.S. Patent Number 6,308,071 issued to Kalev on October 23, 2001 and U.S. Patent Number 7,272,387 issued to Hsu et al. on September 18, 2007 and U. S. Patent Number 7,103,345 issued to Lipsanen on September 6, 2006.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

First, applicants' claim 1 recites,

"a network component that employs a) one or more call characteristics to make a determination to initiate a request to a switch component for one or more positions of one or more mobile stations and b) one or more call parameters to identify one or more cellular network cells associated with the one or more mobile stations, wherein at least one of the one or more call parameters employed to identify one of the one or more cellular network cells is a telephony number of at least one of the one or more mobile stations; and

wherein the network component receives, in response to the request, the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations from a position component that determines the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously; and

wherein the switch component assigns a channel to the at least one of the one or more mobile stations for a call upon a comparison of a calling party number with the at least one of the one or more call parameters."

10

As stated in the Office Action, the Examiner agrees that O'Donnell does **not** specifically disclose "wherein the network component receives, in response to the request, the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations from a position component that determines the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations <u>continuously</u>". The Examiner proposes to combine Kohar with O'Donnell to achieve this limitation. However, applicants assert that the proposed combination of O'Donnell and Kohar does **not** reflect the specific limitations recited in applicants' claim 1 since the resultant system would **not** be a properly functioning system.

Specifically, the Examiner proposes to use **two different** types of position components in order to achieve applicants' claim 1. In particular, the Examiner proposes to use 1) O'Donnell's positioning function 8 and 2) Kohar's position determining means 8. However, there is no way to combine these two devices so as to form applicants' recited "**a position component**" <u>because O'Donnell requires the BSC to invoke the positioning function 8</u> when a quality measure falls below or above a specified threshold to request the identity and geographic location of a mobile's position, as stated in column 6, lines 20-28.

By contrast, Kohar's position determining means 8 does **not** require a request from a BSC to determine a mobile's position. Also, Kohar's position determining means 8 does **not** limit requests for a mobile's position based on a quality measure or threshold. Kohar's position determining means 8 determines a mobile's position <u>continuously or upon request of a second mobile terminal,</u> as stated in column 3, lines 25-27. Since Kohar's position determining means 8 functions in a manner differently than O'Donnell's positioning function 8 and the resultant system would **not** be a properly functioning system, the proposed combination is improper.

Second, the Examiner proposes to combine Lipsanen with O'Donnell as modified by Kohar, Kalev and Hsu. However, applicants assert that the proposed combination of O'Donnell as modified by Kohar, Kalev and Hsu with Lipsanen does **not** reflect the specific limitations recited in applicants' claim 1 since the resultant system would **not** be a properly functioning system. Specifically, the Office Action states that Kalev teaches a network component, i.e., base station controller 4, that employs one or more call parameters, i.e., location area code and cell identity, to identify one or more cellular

11

12   LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

network cells associated with the one or more mobile stations. Also, the Office Action states that Hsu discloses the use of **a telephony number, i.e., the MSISDN of a mobile station, as a <u>specific call parameter</u>**, i.e., "at least one of the one or more call parameters", to identify one or more cellular network cells associated with the one or more mobile stations.

By contrast, Lipsanen does **not** teach the use of a telephony number, i.e., the MSISDN of a mobile station, as a specific call parameter as done in Hsu. Instead, the Examiner asserts "<u>assigning a channel communication for a call between mobile terminal 4 and a fixed telephone 5, wherein the MSC searches a database to verify the A-number before assigning a channel for communication between the mobile telephone 4 and fixed telephone 5</u>" as a specific call parameter. However, the system resulting from the proposed combination of O'Donnell as modified by Kohar, Kalev and Hsu with Lipsanen would **not** be a properly functioning system, because "assigning a channel communication for a call between mobile terminal 4 and a fixed telephone 5, wherein the MSC searches a database to verify the A-number before assigning a channel for communication between the mobile telephone 4 and fixed telephone 5" as done in Lipsanen can**not** be used as a call parameter to "identify one or more cellular network cells associated with the one or more mobile stations" as done in Hsu. Thus, the proposed combination of Lipsanen with O'Donnell as modified by O'Donnell, Kalev and Hsu is improper.

Therefore the proposed combination of O'Donnell as modified by Kohar, Kalev, Hsu and Lipsanen does **not** teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-13, 16-17 and 22-24 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claim 18 has limitations similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the proposed combination. For example, claim 18 recites, "determining the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously" and "wherein a switch component assigns a channel to the at least one of the one or more mobile stations for a call upon a comparison of a calling party number with the at least one of the one or more call parameters". The proposed combination of O'Donnell,

12

13   LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

Kohar, Kalev, Hsu and Lipsanen does not teach or suggest these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claim 18 is likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 19-20 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejections Under O'Donnell, Kohar, Kalev, Hsu, Lipsanen, Jeong and Alperovich

Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of Kohar, Kalev, Hsu, Lipsanen and O'Donnell as applied to claim 13, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 20050119013 issued to Jeong et al. dated June 2, 2005.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over O'Donnell in view of Kohar, Kalev, Hsu, and Lipsanen as applied to claim 16, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,233,448 issued to Alperovich et al. on May 15, 2001.

Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under O'Donnell, Kohar, Kalev, Hsu and Lipsanen being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "determining the one or more positions of the one or more mobile stations continuously" and "wherein a switch component assigns a channel to the at least one of the one or more mobile stations for a call upon a comparison of a calling party number with the at least one of the one or more call parameters", as recited in applicants' independent claims 1 and 18, the proposed combinations of O'Donnell, Kohar, Kalev, Hsu, Lipsanen, Jeong and Alperovich does **not** supply this missing element. Thus, these combinations do **not** make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

New Claims

New claims 25-26 have been added. Claim 25 provides an additional limitation directed to the network component. Claim 26 provides a limitation directed to the one or more call statistics. No new matter has been added.

13

14   LUC-463/Barclay 12-10-6-9

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

James Milton
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: April 30, 2009

CARMEN PATTI LAW GROUP, LLC
Customer Number 47382

14